



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,014	06/15/2001	Michael Smith	1826 (42059-01360)	9634

20350 7590 10/02/2006

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/883,014

Applicant(s)

SMITH, MICHAEL

Examiner

Etienne P LeRoux

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 14-16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 14-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 June 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8/4/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### *Continued Examination*

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 8/4/2006 has been entered.

### *Claim Status*

Claims 8-11, 14-16 and 18-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-7, 12, 13 and 17 have been cancelled. Claims 8-11, 14-16 and 18-20 are rejected in this office action.

### *Drawings*

New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because Figures 3-6 are not legible. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Applicant is required to submit corrected drawings within TWO months of the mailing date of this Office action.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8-10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat No 6,108,691 issued to Lee et al (hereafter Lee) in view of Pub No US 2002/0120716 issued to Raghunathan (hereafter Raghunathan) and further in view of Pub No US 2002/0099723 issued to Garcia-Chiesa (hereafter Garcia-Chiesa).

Claims 8 and 15:

Lee discloses detecting a query from at least one entity over a data network seeking a first view of at least one address entry in a shared directory [Fig 3]

Lee discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose retrieving identification information for the at least one entity, wherein the identification information includes hierarchical information associated with the at least one entity.

Raghunathan discloses retrieving identification information for the at least one entity, wherein the identification information includes hierarchical information associated with the at least one entity [paragraph 17, employees access data depending on their position]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee to include retrieving identification information for the at least one entity, wherein the identification information includes hierarchical information associated with the at least one entity as taught by Raghunathan for the purpose of controlling access to sensitive information.

The combination of Lee and Raghunathan discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above and furthermore, Lee discloses denying access to the first view [col 6, lines 20-40], searching the shared directory to identify entries in the shared directory which includes a plurality of address entries, each of the address entries including hierarchal information wherein searching the shared directory comprises matching the hierarchal information and presenting to the at least one entity initiating the query only identified address entries in a second view [col 6, lines 20-40]

The combination of Lee and Raghunathan discloses the elements of the claimed invention as noted above but does not disclose in a canonical form in a hidden field. Garcia-Chiesa discloses a canonical form in a hidden field [paragraph 39]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Lee and Raghunathan to include a canonical form in a hidden field as taught by Garcai-Chiesa for the purpose of de-contextualizing individual documents [paragraph 39]

Claim 9:

The combination of Lee, Raghunathan and Garcia-Chiesa discloses the elements of claim 8 as noted above and furthermore, Lee discloses wherein the shared directory is configurable for supporting emessaging [abstract]

Claim 10:

The combination of Lee, Raghunathan and Garcia-Chiesa discloses the elements of claim 8 as noted above and furthermore, Lee discloses wherein the entities comprise at least one of at least one person and at least one group [col 6, lines 20-40]

Art Unit: 2161

Claims 14, 16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Lee, Raghunathan and Garcia-Chiesa and further in view of US Pat No 5,878,415 issued to Olds (hereafter Olds).

Claims 14 and 19:

The combination of Lee, Raghunathan and Garcia-Chiesa discloses the elements of claim 8 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the first view is a listing of all entries in the directory and the second view is a copy of the listing with modified selection criteria. Olds discloses wherein the first view is a listing of all entries in the directory and the second view is a copy of the listing with modified selection criteria [Olds, administrator is able to make global changes thus has global access, col 3, lines 55-65, user is granted access per the access control list 74, Fig 4, col 8, line 61 – col 9, line 2]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include wherein the first view is a listing of all entries in the directory and the second view is a copy of the listing with modified selection criteria as taught by Olds for the purpose of obtaining a display of all records in the database.

Claim 16:

The combination of Lee, Raghunathan, Garcia-Chiesa and Olds discloses the elements of claim 15 as noted above and furthermore, Olds discloses wherein the data network is the internet and the server is configured to communicate with web browsers [Olds, col 6, lines 3-12]

Claim 18:

The combination of Lee, Raghunathan, Garcia-Chiesa and Olds discloses the elements of claim 15 as noted above and furthermore, discloses Olds discloses wherein the server and

Art Unit: 2161

directory are configured to provide hosted emessaging services for a plurality of third parties

[Olds, Fig 1, 20,col 6, line 44 – 58]

Claims 11 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Lee, Raghunathan and Garcia-Chiesa and further in view of Pub No US 2002/0104018 issued to Singhani et al (hereafter Singhani).

Claims 11 and 20:

The combination of Lee, Raghunathan and Garcia-Chiesa discloses the elements of claim 8/15 as noted above but does not disclose wherein the hierarchal information includes at least one of company name and company location. Singhani discloses wherein the hierarchal information includes at least one of company name and company location [paragraph 57]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above combination of references to include wherein the hierarchal information includes at least one of company name and company location as taught by Singhani for the purpose of providing necessary information for the purposes of approving/rejecting by an application administrator a request by a user for access to an application [paragraph 57].

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 8/4/2006 have been fully considered but are moot based on above new grounds of rejection necessitated by Applicant's claim amendments.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne P. LeRoux whose telephone number is (571) 272-4022. The examiner can normally be reached Monday – Friday between 8:00 am and 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Etienne LeRoux

9/22/2006



Primary Examiner